



3200 WEST 300 NORTH
WEST POINT CITY, UT 84015

WEST POINT CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 28, 2025

WORK SESSION 6:00 PM

Planning Commission Present: Chairperson PJ Roubinet, Vice-Chair Rochelle Farnsworth, Commissioner Adam King, Commissioner Joe Taylor, and Commissioner Spencer Wade

Planning Commission Excused: Commissioner Jeff Turner

City Staff Present: Troy Moyes, City Planner; Katie Hansen, Deputy City Recorder

City Staff Excused: Bryn MacDonald, Community Development Director

Visitors: Anthony Hind

1. Discussion of revisions to the sign code

Troy Moyes explained that the staff's goal for the year was to complete a full rewrite of the sign code, which had not been substantially updated since around 2010. At that time, the city looked very different, and the existing code now contained many gray areas, especially since it primarily addressed commercial development. About eight months earlier, staff had introduced the topic to the Planning Commission, reviewing what could and could not be restricted under the First Amendment. The rewrite is needed to produce an ordinance that is constitutional, fair, and easy to administer.

He emphasized that regulations could not be based on the content or viewpoint of a sign's message. Instead, rules should focus on neutral factors such as size, placement, and setbacks. The 2015 Supreme Court case *Reed v. Town of Gilbert, Arizona* clarified that content-based regulations were unconstitutional. For example, Gilbert had applied different rules for religious event signs, political signs, and other categories, which the court struck down. Troy Moyes explained that if a regulation required reading the sign to determine compliance, it was illegal.

He noted that the city's current code contained categories such as political signs, real estate signs, construction signs, advertising signs, and event signs, all of which were unenforceable under constitutional standards. The city instead needed to establish general rules that applied equally across all signs. For example, they could prohibit billboard signage on freeways altogether, but they would need to clearly define what constituted a billboard to avoid ambiguity.

Commissioner Roubinet asked whether the new code would apply only to private property or also to city property, noting that state law already regulated signs in public rights-of-way. Troy Moyes

clarified that while UDOT controlled only the right-of-way, the city had authority over every parcel of land within its boundaries. Commissioner Roubinet suggested that city property might be easier to regulate with a simple prohibition, while private property could be handled separately. Troy Moyes responded that the issue was complex because, for instance, if the city placed a sign on its own property, it could technically be violating its own code. Therefore, the regulations needed to be broad enough to account for such scenarios.

Commissioner King asked if regulation would then be limited to factors like placement, size, and brightness. Troy Moyes confirmed, adding that all content-based sign categories in the current code would need to be eliminated.

Commissioner Wade asked if the listed signs were still included in the current code. Troy Moyes confirmed they were and explained that the city's existing code technically violated free speech protections because it identified content to determine where signs could or could not be placed, mirroring the same issue that had been struck down in *Reed v. Gilbert*. Commissioner King noted that those sections needed to be removed and replaced with more general regulations, which Troy Moyes confirmed. Commissioner King emphasized that the focus should be on creating equity in regulations without reference to content.

Troy Moyes explained that certain sign types, such as sidewalk signs, vertical banners, tube signs, and yard signs, could still be defined in the code, but regulation should focus on aspects such as size, location, and potential safety impacts. For example, temporary signs created problems because the code defined them as limited to 30 days without clarifying whether removing and replacing them restarted the time period. He pointed out that excessive temporary signage along major roads could also create safety hazards by distracting drivers.

Commissioner Roubinet suggested that the city consider using language from the Utah Outdoor Advertising Act, which already addressed event advertising and sign restrictions for public assembly facilities. He also supported a blanket prohibition on signs on city-owned property to simplify enforcement and proposed integrating limits into the landscape code. He added that intensity and safety concerns, such as blocking intersections or driveways, could justify restrictions.

Troy Moyes explained that instead of making piecemeal edits, the city planned to repeal and replace the code entirely with a clearer version that included visual examples distinguishing sign types like pole signs versus monument signs. Commissioner Wade asked if regulations would differ by zoning, such as allowing larger pole signs in commercial areas near freeway interchanges. Troy Moyes confirmed zoning distinctions would likely be part of the code and emphasized that size, materials, lighting, portability, and use of public property could all be regulated, but again, without regard to message.

Commissioner Farnsworth asked whether only city signs could be placed on city property. Troy Moyes said that might be a legal question, while Commissioner Roubinet explained that UDOT already used a blanket prohibition, removing all advertising signs from rights-of-way except official sponsor-a-highway signage. Troy Moyes noted that UDOT signage was different since it served public purposes like safety and traffic control. He said the city had already prohibited billboards

through a prior amendment but needed to clarify definitions and eliminate confusing or contradictory provisions, particularly around temporary signs.

Commissioner King asked if park strips counted as public property. Troy Moyes confirmed they were part of the right-of-way and raised questions about political signs in such locations. He explained that regulating those cases was complicated because many city streets lacked sidewalks, meaning portions of front yards technically fell within the public right-of-way. The new code would need to address such scenarios.

Troy Moyes added that temporary signage could be regulated differently in commercial and residential zones, with distinctions made by size and duration. Commissioner Wade pointed out the difficulty of regulating signs like real estate listings that often exceeded 30 days, since enforcement could require removing and replacing signs. Troy Moyes explained that the city could not regulate by content, so rules needed to apply equally. For example, allowing six-square-foot yard signs in residential areas regardless of whether they were political or real estate signs. Commissioner King agreed, noting that any mention of content created constitutional problems. Troy Moyes concluded that even distinctions like permitting banner signs, but not grand opening banners would be problematic because they referenced content.

Commissioner Roubinet suggested that political signs in park strips could be regulated as safety concerns if they blocked visibility for motorists or driveways, though he questioned whether a stricter approach might be necessary. Troy Moyes responded that the first step should be defining types of signs—such as on-premise, freestanding, marquee, projecting wall, roof, and trailer signs—since unclear definitions quickly created confusion. He noted the difficulty of determining whether architectural features, like an ice cream cone on a roof, qualified as signage. Overregulation, he cautioned, could make the code overly complex.

Commissioner King asked about including visuals in the code, and Troy Moyes confirmed that graphics would help clarify measurements, such as sign height, and distinguish between monument, pole, and pylon signs. He cited issues with light pollution, like at Ogden Clinic, and suggested that photometric standards might be needed. Troy Moyes outlined elements of a new ordinance: a purpose statement, definitions, measurement standards, placement, height and area rules, enforcement provisions, regulations for temporary and prohibited signs, and treatment of nonconforming signs. Nonconforming signs, he said, would remain legal until removed, after which replacements would need to meet new standards.

Troy Moyes explained that some code sections, such as signs permitted by zone, referenced content and would need to be eliminated. He noted that residential development signage was less of a problem now but still raised questions about whether subdivision entry signs or developer flags counted as signage. Commissioners debated whether new residential construction warranted separate temporary sign allowances, but Troy Moyes said it was unlikely a new zone would be created. Instead, clear definitions would prevent homeowners from misusing allowances intended for subdivision entry signs.

Troy Moyes clarified that only narrow categories of signage—such as obscenity, threats, or incitement to lawless action—could be prohibited under free speech case law. Commissioner

Roubinet asked whether such threatening signs were common, but Troy Moyes said they were rare. He emphasized that while the city could regulate size and placement, it could not regulate content.

Commissioner Taylor asked if flags with words counted as signs, and Troy Moyes confirmed they did, though he warned against overregulating unusual cases like holiday lights with text. Commissioner King summarized that staff would strike content-based rules and bring back a full rewrite, beginning with definitions, which Troy Moyes confirmed. He said the process would take time, with Bryn MacDonald's goal being completion by spring. Enforcement questions, such as regulating dilapidated signs or distinguishing art from signage, also needed attention.

Commissioners discussed whether city murals or painted signs would require approval, and Troy Moyes said some might need conditional use review. He agreed that lighting regulations for signage could mirror those already in place for buildings, citing past examples where light direction and intensity had been regulated. He also noted neighbor disputes in other cities where signage created tension, reinforcing the need for clear rules.

Troy Moyes outlined next steps: Review definitions, create a zoning table, specify setbacks and height, remove content based criteria, and consider new options for freeway-adjacent or large commercial centers. Discussion turned to electronic signs, with Commissioner Taylor raising concerns about brightness at night. Troy Moyes said some cities required dimming during certain hours, but warned that overregulation could discourage better design, as seen with a sign in Syracuse that ended up less attractive due to strict rules. Commissioner Farnsworth suggested requiring signs to be turned off after business hours, but Troy Moyes said such a rule would need to apply to all and could overlap with dark-sky ordinances. He noted that Park City had very strict lighting rules requiring downward shielding and dimming, but West Point would face challenges with existing nonconforming signs. He also reminded commissioners that schools typically operated outside city authority regarding signage.

2. Review of agenda items

This item was not discussed.

3. Staff Update

Troy Moyes reported that the A-20 zone had been approved with a change requiring a literal half-acre minimum. The Matt Leavitt item remained tabled at City Council, while the landscaping ordinance was scheduled for decision at the next meeting. Commissioner Roubinet noted that the Weber Basin representative informed the Council their new meters could track both time and duration of use, revealing some residents consumed 3,000–4,000 gallons of water weekly—an amount intended for a full month. He expressed surprise at this finding. The Council also approved a limit of no more than 35% lawn coverage for new construction. Additionally, the primary election had been certified at a separate meeting.

Troy Moyes reported a new annexation for the Allen subdivision, which the City Council approved with an A-5 zone designation. The annexation still requires approval from the county and the lieutenant governor's office.

He also updated commissioners on development projects. Ogden Clinic's building permits had been approved, with construction expected to begin soon. At Nielsen Crossing phases one and two, developers tied into 2000 West and were preparing to record the plat so builders could begin home construction. Bennett Legacy phase three had been submitted to the county, with permits anticipated along 1300 North and 4500 West. Townhomes were also under construction at 4500 West and 1800 North.

Regarding the Cowley property, previously rezoned for 9–10 lots, Troy Moyes said the project was on hold while owners attempted to secure more property to make infrastructure costs feasible. He anticipated delays until additional land could be acquired.

He also noted that the Foothill Ditch annexation, in dispute with Clinton City since 2019, would likely bring a general plan amendment request in September. The property was previously tabled at an R-4 designation of eight units per acre, while the city's updated R-4 allowed six units per acre. Developers were reportedly seeking nine units per acre with detached homes, though no formal plans had been submitted.

Finally, Troy Moyes stated that the property south of Big O Tires—known locally as the house with many rocks—might also come forward with a general plan amendment request to change its designation from residential to commercial.



3200 WEST 300 NORTH
WEST POINT CITY, UT 84015

WEST POINT CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

AUGUST 28, 2025

GENERAL SESSION 7:00 PM

Planning Commission Present: Chairperson PJ Roubinet, Vice-Chair Rochelle Farnsworth, Commissioner Adam King, Commissioner Joe Taylor, and Commissioner Spencer Wade

Planning Commission Excused: Commissioner Jeff Turner

City Staff Present: Troy Moyes, City Planner; Katie Hansen, Deputy City Recorder

City Staff Excused: Bryn MacDonald, Community Development Director

Visitors: Anthony Hind, Mike Bastian

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Pledge of Allegiance**
3. **Prayer** – Commissioner Wade
4. **Disclosures from Planning Commissioners**

There were no disclosures from the Planning Commissioners.

5. **Public Comments**

There were no public comments.

6. **Approval of minutes from the May 22, 2025 Planning Commission meeting**

Commissioner King motioned to approve the minutes from the May 22, 2025 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Taylor seconded the motion. All voted aye.

7. **Approval of minutes from the August 14, 2025 Planning Commission meeting**

Commissioner Taylor motioned to approved the minutes from the August 14, 2025 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Farnsworth seconded the motion. All voted aye.

8. **Discussion and consideration to amend the development agreement for the Heritage Point subdivision located at approximately 5000 W 2425 N; *Mike Bastian, applicant***

On June 17, 2025, the City Council approved a Planned Residential Unit Development (PRUD) overlay zone and development agreement for 82.94 acres at approximately 2350 North 5000 West known as the future Heritage Point Subdivision. The PRUD approval allowed up to 213 single-family lots with a minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet (as required by ordinance for the R-1 PRUD overlay zone), in exchange for the dedication of regional trail connections, open space, and architectural design standards. The applicant, Mike Bastian representing Heritage Point Development, is now requesting an amendment to the approved development agreement.

Amendments to development agreements require a public hearing before the Planning Commission, which then makes a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will make the final decision to approve, deny, or modify the request.

The applicant is requesting a modification to the approved development agreement that would allow 46 lots in the Heritage Point subdivision to be slightly under the 10,000 sq. ft. minimum required by the PRUD ordinance. The smallest proposed lots in this subdivision are approximately 9,819 sq. ft., with most lots between 9,820–9,944 sq. ft. According to the applicant, this adjustment will provide “flexibility to design wider lots that can better accommodate single-level ramblers and other home plans that require greater frontage, while preserving the overall neighborhood character.”

	Approved Concept Plan (June 2025)	Proposed Amendment (Aug 2025)
Total Lots	213	211
Lots < 10,000 sq. ft.	0	46 (22%)
Smallest Lot Size	10,005 sq. ft.	9,819 sq. ft.
Density	2.568 units/acre	2.568 units/acre
Bonus Density	16%	16%
Open Space	202,753 sq. ft. (5.61%)	187,268 sq. ft. (5.61%)
Average Lot Width	95.36'	95.36'

Commissioner Roubinet noted that the smallest lot size had been reduced from 10,000 square feet to 9,819 square feet, which meant a maximum reduction of about 200 square feet on 46 lots. He observed that the change still resulted in fewer homes per square foot than before. Troy Moyes explained that some lots had actually increased in size, balancing the reductions and keeping the overall change under 20%. The only open space adjustment was about three feet, totaling less than 1,000 square feet, with no other changes to the plan.

Commissioner Wade asked if the adjustment was to accommodate specific house types. Developer Mike Bastian of Lone Pine Development said some lots were widened to better fit rambler-style homes, but most house plans would still work and none would result in unusually small homes. He

clarified that the reductions mostly involved shifting lot frontage and slightly reducing depths from about 115 to 111–112 feet. He also noted a potential benefit of reducing required water shares under Hopper Irrigation’s formula, though that was not yet confirmed.

Mr. Bastian explained that most changes occurred on the west side, while third-acre lots remained unchanged. Troy Moyes added that only minor adjustments were made, including a slight shift to the detention basin and road realignment. Mr. Bastian further noted that this road shift would align with an established neighbor’s roadway, creating a shared access point supported by UDOT, which improved circulation for both properties.

No further questions were raised.

a. Public Hearing

Anthony Hind, West Point: Mr. Hind stated that he had recently met with staff members Troy Moyes and Boyd Davis. He explained that he had started a new organization called the Safe Streets Collective, which aimed to make West Point a safer city for pedestrians, cyclists, and disabled persons. He said he had floated the idea of replacing the standard sidewalk and park strip with a bike path. Instead of requiring the developer to put in the sidewalk and park strip, which he felt was somewhat wasteful, he suggested using that space for a dedicated bike path of 10 to 12 feet in width. Mr. Hind noted that earlier in the day he had met with UDOT and their trails division, and when he presented the idea to Stephanie from that group, she thought it was an excellent concept. He said the plan would open the space for greater use, benefitting not only pedestrians and cyclists but also disabled persons. He added that he had received frequent feedback about 4500 West, where cyclists struggled to use the corridor because of limited shoulders. He described riding near the new schools where the sidewalk zigzagged in what he called “a mess.” Mr. Hind suggested that along 5000 West and 2425 North, each developer could be required to put in a bike path section instead of a sidewalk. He explained that such a requirement would make the area much more accessible for all people who were not in cars. He concluded by stating that he would love to discuss the idea further and work toward making it possible for the city.

There were no more public comments.

Commissioner King motioned to close the public hearing
Commissioner Farnsworth seconded the motion
All voted aye.

b. Decision

Commissioner Roubinet explained that part of the reason the development was approved in its current form was because the developer agreed to dedicate green space for a future regional trail connection. He noted that the city had been considering trail planning in the area, and this section was intended to support those efforts. He added that 4500 West would likely not remain in its current configuration once additional development occurred and suggested Boyd Davis as

the best person to consult regarding future plans. He also mentioned that UDOT was working on connected trails and that the city already had a strong future trail network plan.

Commissioner King motioned to recommend approval of the proposed amendment to the Heritage Point PRUD development agreement, located at approximately 2350 North 5000 West, to allow 46 lots to be between 9,800 and 10,000 square feet as presented, and forward this recommendation of approval to the City Council for consideration. Commissioner Taylor seconded the motion.

Commissioner Taylor – Aye
Commissioner Farnsworth – Aye
Commissioner Wade – Aye
Commissioner King – Aye
Commissioner Roubinet – Aye

Motion passed unanimously.

9. Planning Commission Comments

Commissioner Wade had no comment.

Commissioner Farnsworth had no comment.

Commissioner Taylor stated City Hall parking lot looks nice now that it has been repaved and new lines have been painted.

Commissioner King commented on whether the proposal was suggesting replacing sidewalks and park strips with a continuous blacktop bike path. He expressed support for the idea on certain major roads, noting that as a runner he preferred blacktop over concrete because it was softer on the joints and more comfortable for both runners and cyclists. He acknowledged that such a plan might eliminate street trees in some areas but believed the benefits of a wider, shared-use path outweighed the drawbacks. He concluded by noting that the responsibility for constructing the paths would likely fall on developers and thanked the group for the discussion.

Commissioner Roubinet thanked the Planning Commissioners for their time and dedication as well as staff for their hard work.

10. Adjournment

Commissioner King adjourned the meeting at 7:32 pm. Commissioner Farnsworth seconded the motion. All voted aye.


Chairperson – PJ Roubinet
Deputy City Recorder– Katie Hansen